

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

CHAMBERS OF
LOIS H. GOODMAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

CLARKSON S. FISHER U.S. COURTHOUSE
402 EAST STATE STREET
ROOM 7050
TRENTON, NJ 08608
609-989-2114

March 8, 2021

LETTER ORDER

**Re: RUTH T. MCLEAN v. 800 DC LLC, et al.,
Civil Action No. 19-17310 (BRM) (LHG)**

Dear Counsel and *Pro Se* Party:

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Redact and seal Transcript/Digital Recording. [Docket Entry No. 39]. The Motion first requests that the Court redact the transcripts of hearings held before the Honorable Brian R. Martinotti, U.S.D.J., on October 16, 2019 and January 7, 2020 under "Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2(a) (personal identifiers)." *Id.* The Motion also requests that the Court redact and seal the transcripts "pursuant to L.Civ. R. 5.3(g)." No opposition was filed.

With respect to the Plaintiff's first request, the Court notes that Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2(a) protects only limited categories of personal information, specifically, social security numbers, tax-identification numbers, birth dates, names of minors, and financial-account numbers. Plaintiff's request points to no such protectible information in the transcripts, nor was the Court able to find any after its own careful review. Accordingly, this portion of Plaintiff's request is DENIED.

Plaintiff's parallel request under Local Rule 5.3(g) fares no better. As a preliminary matter, Plaintiff's request is procedurally defective. Under Rule 5.3(g), a party requesting to redact and seal a transcript is required to file a motion that complies with Local Rule 5.3(c), which includes various procedural and substantive requirements that a party must meet for the Court to properly consider the merits of the request. *See* L. Civ. R. Civ. 5.3(c)(1), (3). Plaintiff's one-page motion does not meet any of the elements under Rule 5.3(c). Given that Plaintiff is *pro se*, the Court might be inclined to relax the procedural requirements, but Plaintiff's request is also devoid of substance. Rule 5.3 provides a mechanism by which parties may seek to protect from public view information that they contend is confidential. Here, Plaintiff identifies no information from the transcript that she deems confidential or the reasons she believes it to be so. Moreover, on its own review, the Court could find no confidential information that Plaintiff might appropriately be seeking to protect under Rule 5.3. Accordingly, this portion of Plaintiff's request is also DENIED.


LOIS H. GOODMAN
United States Magistrate Judge